

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 26 2004

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

Applicant:	David Matela et al.	Docket No.:	16258
Serial No.:	10/023,148	Group:	1771
Confirmation No:	3181	Examiner:	Lynda Salvatore
Filed:	December 13, 2001	Date:	November 26, 2004

For: COFORM NONWOVEN WEB AND METHOD OF MAKING SAME

Petition for One-Month Extension of Time

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

An Office Action which, on its face, granted a one (1) month period of time in which to respond thereto was mailed on July 29, 2004, with respect to the above-identified presently pending application. Accordingly, the shortened statutory period for response was set to end on October 29, 2004.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), Applicants hereby request a one (1) month extension of time in which to respond to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, the period of response is to be extended until November 29, 2004.

Please charge the \$110.00 fee for this extension of time designated by 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a)(1) to Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc. deposit account number 11-0875. This extension request is submitted in duplicate.

The undersigned may be reached: 770-587-8620.

Respectfully submitted,

David Matela et al.

By:


Christos S. Kyriakou

Registration No.: 42,776

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I, Christos S. Kyriakou, hereby certify that on November 26, 2004, this document is being faxed to The United States Patent and Trademark Office at 703-872-9306.

By:


Christos S. Kyriakou

Appl. No. 10/023,148
Amdt. dated 11/26/04
Reply to Office Action of 7/29/04

teach of suggest uniformly dispersing a second material into substantially continuous multicomponent filaments for the reasons stated above. More specifically, Jackson, Neely and Everett, individually and in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest how to uniform disperse a second material into substantially continuous multicomponent filaments as stated above. Fontenot fails to cure such deficiencies. Therefore, the rejection of claims 10 and 11 as allegedly being unpatentable over Jackson and/or Neely in view of Everett and further in view of Fontenot is untenable and should be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Neely in view of Everett as applied to claims 1 and 8 and further in view of JP 2001181932 to Nippon Ester Co. This rejection is also respectfully traversed. Neely and Everett, individually and in combination, fail to disclose, teach of suggest uniformly dispersing a second material into substantially continuous multicomponent filaments for the reasons stated above. More specifically, Neely and Everett, individually and in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest how to uniform disperse a second material into substantially continuous multicomponent filaments as stated above. JP 2001181932 fails to cure such deficiencies. Therefore, the rejection of claims 9 and 19 as allegedly being unpatentable over Neely in view of Everett and further in view of JP 2001181932 is untenable and should be withdrawn.


Should any issues remain after consideration of this response, Examiner Salvatore is invited and strongly encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (770) 587-8620.

Please charge any prosecutorial fees which are due to Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc. deposit account number 11-0875.

The undersigned may be reached at: (770) 587-8620.

Respectfully submitted,
David Matela et al.

By:


Christos S. Kyriakou
Registration No.: 42,776